





Intelligence.

Book 2.

Section 1.

During the so-called Dark ages, there were many who professed faith in a legendary amulet known as 'The Philosopher's Stone.' Even those most devoid of sense, so it was claimed, could attain wisdom and have their problems effortlessly solved for them were they to rub it. And then - the final perfection! - it could transmute baser metal into gold.

1.

But the masters of the hermetic art,

although not the imitative charlatans or

'puffers,' meant by the philosopher's stone

During the so-called Dark ages, there were not a thing of stone but a means of attaining many who professed faith in a legendary amulet known as 'The Philosopher's Stone.' Even those by alchemy, the transmutatory process leading most devoid of sense, so it was claimed, could

thereby attain wisdom and have their problems effortlessly solved for them were they to rub it.

And then - the final perfection! - it could transmute baser metal into gold.

In our belief that were it possible for us to define But the masters of the hermetic art, although not the imitative charlatans or as 'puffers,' meant by the philosopher's stone not a thing of stone but a means of attaining growth; by gold, wisdom or intelligence; and in by alchemy, the transformatory process leading be thereto. It might serve us as a potent amulet which would not require rubbing, for by a mere ceremonial inspection it would give surpassing wisdom?

In our belief that were it possible for us to define intelligence, we should attain to it only by that - would it not seem that we are as credulous as the ~~puffer~~^{puffer-alchemists?}? Why else do we imagine that lying behind each intelligent action is some potent nucleus or core? Is it not that implicit in this assumption is the belief that could it be abstracted, it might serve us as a potent amulet which would not require rubbing, for by a mere ceremonial inspection, it would give surpassing wisdom?

he conceives to be gratuitously endowed with intelligence. He assumes that those who are capable are born-capable, that their keen insight and sensitivity are, in the main, just ancestral gifts.

They are, in the main, potentialities which become tendencies but not just by ancestral accumulations. Ancestral accumulation occurs and is correct only if (it is) understood to refer to all humanity and not alone to the branchings of immediate parentage.

To suppose that the intelligent cannot

have to exert themselves to think

But this is false because it is born of a mediocre tendency to ascribe to others only those is and how it comes about, we must first strive motivations known to him through an impoverished to observe how it does not come about. The experience of himself. Since he has never, individual, whatever his scholastic attainments, who with much or small effort drifts except when compelled to do so, made a serious enough effort to think, he assumes that the same from one imitative impression to another, holds true for men of intelligence. How else in his ignorance supposes that the reputedly but by some magical entity, some inherited intelligent are the possessors of some sort conjunction of favorable genetic factors, shall he of philosopher's stone. He assumes that explain their accomplishments compared to which thought is easy of attainment for those who his own are so paltry? But what presents an he conceives to be gratuitously endowed with equally involved problem is why so many of us intelligence. He assumes that those who are who teach and who so tenaciously refer to the capable are born capable, that their keen word 'intelligence,' finding so many occasions to insight and sensitivity are, in the main, include it in our verbal exhortations, do not just ancestral gifts.

They are, in the main, potentialities exponents of this indispensable means to secure which become tendencies but not just by living. Through a closer observance of its ancestral accumulations. Ancestral accumulation ^{does} occurs and is correct ^{but} only if (it is) fluctuations in our own behavior, we might understood to refer to all humanity and not ever ^{just} come to speak with an authority that alone to the branchings of immediate parentage. is deserved because it has been earned. But we still have only some convenient idea of intelligence, not the true experience. Wherefore, our excess of speech about it.

To suppose that the intelligent do not have to exert themselves to think

~~But this~~ is false because it is born of a mediocre tendency to ascribe to others only those motivations known to him through an impoverished experience of himself. Since he has never, except when compelled to do so, made a serious enough effort to think, he assumes that the same holds true for men of intelligence. How else but by some magical entity, some inherited conjunction of favorable genic factors, shall he explain their accomplishments compared to which his own are so paltry? But what presents an equally involved problem is why so many of us who teach and who so tenaciously refer to the word 'intelligence,' finding so many occasions to include it in our verbal exhortations, do not choose to go further by becoming practical exponents of this indispensable means to secure living. Through a closer observance of its functional expressions, of its quicksilver-like fluctuations in our own behavior, we might eventually come to speak with an authority that is deserved because it has been earned. But we still have only some convenient idea of intelligence, not the true experience. Wherefore, our excess of speech about it.

not answer the
- sure to be
as to why the
ent exert them-
o think while the
do not. It is
, people may say,
tion or effort to
then intelligence,
this exertion is
d. Could you not
is by saying that
le have in them
or nature this
exert themselves,
education dis-
it in most. But
es the question
the education
uly intelligent
crush their
think - alto-